

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the final Office Action mailed on January 9, 2007.

Claim 1 is amended. Claims 1-20 and 22-27 are pending.

Claims 1-20, 22, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnegger (US 4,513,742) in view of Sonefors (US 5,361,665).

Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being unpatentable over Arnegger in view of Sonefors, in further view of Gerber (US 4,653,373).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in view of the amended claims and the following comments.

Discussion of Amended Claims

Claim 1 is amended to specify a plurality of recesses extending between opposite sides of the holder body. The recesses (e.g., recesses 34 shown in Applicant's Figure 1) function to guide away cut material. In addition, the recesses reduce the mass of the saw blade. Further, the recesses reduce the effective surface area of the saw blade, thus reducing the frictional effect of the saw blade (see, e.g., Applicant's specification, page 9, lines 14-15, and Figures 1 and 2).

Discussion of Prior Art

During a follow-up discussion with the Examiner subsequent to the March 20, 2007 telephone interview, the Examiner indicated that while Applicant's claim 1 was broadly written and thus obvious in view of the combined disclosures of Arnegger and Sonefors, the Examiner suggested that amending claim 1 to include the features of the blade as shown in Applicant's Figure 2 would serve to overcome the rejections based on Arnegger and Sonefors.

Applicant has amended claim 1 herein in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. In particular, claim 1 is amended as discussed above to specify that a plurality of recesses extend between opposite sides of the holder body. For example, Applicant's Figure 1 shows recesses 34 extending between opposite sides 36, 38 of the holder body 12. The recesses are shown in perspective in Figure 2 (reference 35 denotes the recess-bases of the recesses).

The recesses of Applicant's claimed saw blade provide advantages, such as reduced mass, reduced friction, and guidance of cut material, that are not provided by the saw blades disclosed in Arneggor and Sonefors.

Neither Arneggor nor Sonefors discloses or remotely suggests a saw blade with a plurality of recesses extending between opposite sides of a holder body, as claimed by Applicant.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is not anticipated by and would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art in view of Arnegger, taken alone or in combination with any of the other prior art of record.

Further remarks regarding the asserted relationship between Applicant's claims and the prior art are not deemed necessary, in view of the amended claims and the foregoing discussion. Applicant's silence as to any of the Examiner's comments is not indicative of an acquiescence to the stated grounds of rejection.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this application, allow each of the pending claims and to pass this application on to an early issue. If there are any remaining issues that need to be addressed in order to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


Douglas M. McAllister
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 37,886
Lipsitz & McAllister, LLC
755 Main Street
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 459-0200